

Panaji, 24th October, 2019 (Kartika 2, 1941)

SERIES II No. 30

# OFFICIAL GAZETTE



# GOVERNMENT OF GOA

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

Note:- There are two Extraordinary issues to the Official Gazette, Series II No. 29 dated 17-10-2019 as follows:—

- (1) Extraordinary dated 17-10-2019 from pages 507 to 508 regarding Notifications from Department of Finance.
- (2) Extraordinary (No. 2) dated 21-10-2019 from pages 509 to 510 regarding Notification from Department of Elections.

## GOVERNMENT OF GOA

Department of Education, Art & Culture

Directorate of Education

### Order

No. 1(2)-9-2003/SE/Part-II/128

On the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission as conveyed vide their letter No. COM/II/15 (3)/2012/147 dated 15-07-2019, Government is pleased to promote Kum. Gautami Shripad Dessai, Teacher Grade I to the post in the cadre of Vice-Principal-Teachers Training College/Vice-Principal-Government Higher Secondary School/Headmaster-Government High School, Group "B" Gazetted in "Level 10" of the Pay Matrix of 7th Pay Commission on regular basis under the Directorate of Education, with immediate effect.

She shall be on probation for a period of two years.

She shall exercise option for fixation of pay in terms of F.R. 22(I)(a)(1) within one month from the date of issue of this order.

She shall give in writing her acceptance/refusal of above promotion to the undersigned within 10 days from the date of issue of order, failing which, it will be presumed as refusal of promotion by the promoted officer and she shall be debarred for promotion for a period of one year from the date of refusal of promotion or till next vacancy arises whichever is later, without any further intimation.

Sr. No.	Name of the Officer	Present place of posting	Place of posting on promotion
1	2	3	4
1.	Kum. Gautami Shripad Dessai	Headmaster, Government High School, Fatorpa, Quepem-Goa (on officiating basis)	Headmaster, Government High School, Fatorpa, Quepem-Goa.

She shall submit her joining report to this Directorate, respective Zonal Officer and Directorate of Accounts, Panaji.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Vandana Rao, IAS, Director (Education).

Porvorim, 7th October, 2019.

**Order**

No. 18/14/92-RV-EDN-P-I/133

As per the provisions of Section 7(7) of Goa Board of Secondary and Higher Secondary Education Board Act, 1975, the Government is pleased to appoint Shri Guruprasad Pawaskar, Chairman, Sanjay School, Porvorim, as Vice-Chairman of Goa Board of Secondary and Higher Secondary Education, Alto Betim with effect from the date of his taking over the charge.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Vandana Rao, IAS, Director & ex officio Jt. Secretary (Education).

Porvorim, 10th October, 2019.



Directorate of Higher Education

**Order**

No. ACAD III/GC-04/CAS/50/2019/6236

Read: Government Order No. 23/2/2001-DHE-(ix)/224 dated 03-02-2006.

On the recommendation of the Screening Committee, Government is pleased to revise the eligibility dates of grant of Senior Scale (Pre-Revised Rs. 10,000-325-15,200) (Revised Rs. 15,600-39,100+AGP Rs. 7,000) and Selection Grade (Pre-Revised Rs. 12,000-420-18,300) (Revised Rs. 15,600-39,100+AGP Rs. 8000) as per the University Grants Commission guidelines to Dr. Remy Dias, Associate Professor in History, Government College of Arts, Science and Commerce Quepem-Goa with effect from the date indicated against his name:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Lecturer	Date of review of eligibility for Senior Scale (Pre-Revised Rs. 10,000-325-15,200) (Revised Rs. 15,600-39,100+AGP Rs. 7,000)	Date of review of eligibility for Selection Grade (Pre-Revised Rs. 12,000-420-18,300) (Revised Rs. 15,600-39,100+AGP Rs. 8,000)
1.	Dr. Remy Dias, Associate Professor in History, Government College of Arts, Science and Commerce, Quepem-Goa	01-07-1998	01-07-2003.

Dr. Remy Dias, shall be designated as Associate Professor with effect from 01-07-2006 and shall be placed in appropriate revised scale PB 4 Rs. 37,400-67,000 with AGP Rs. 9,000.

The Pay shall be fixed as per the rules in force accordingly.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Prasad G. Volvoikar, Under Secretary (Higher Education).

Porvorim, 16th October, 2019.

**Order**

No. ACAD III/GC-04/CAS/50/2019/6237

Read: Government Order No. 8/1/2016-DHE/2766 dated 28-12-2016.

On the recommendation of the Screening Committee, Government is pleased to revise the eligibility dates of grant of Selection Grade (Pre-Revised Rs. 12,000-420-18,300) (Revised Rs. 15,600-39,100+AGP Rs. 8,000) as per the University Grants Commission guidelines to Dr. Annie F. D'Souza e Gomes, Assistant Professor in Botany, Government College of Arts, Science and Commerce, Quepem-Goa with effect from the date indicated against her name:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Lecturer	Date of review of Eligibility for Selection Grade (Pre-Revised Rs. 12,000-420-18,300) Revised Rs. 15,600-39,100+AGP Rs. 8,000)
1.	Dr. Annie F. D'Souza e Gomes, Assistant Professor in Botany, Government College of Arts, Science and Commerce, Quepem-Goa	31-01-2013.

The Pay shall be fixed as per the rules in force accordingly.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*Prasad G. Volvoikar*, Under Secretary (Higher Education).

Porvorim, 16th October, 2019.

#### Order

No. ACAD III/GC-04/CAS/50/2019/6238

On the recommendation of the Screening Committee, Government is pleased to grant Stage 2 (Pre-Revised Rs. 10,000-325-15,200) (Revised Rs. 15,600-39,100+AGP Rs. 7,000) as per the University Grants Commission guidelines to Dr. Roshan Usapkar, Assistant Professor in Commerce, Sant Sohrobanth Ambiyé Government College of Arts and Commerce, Pernem-Goa with effect from the date indicated against her name:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Lecturer	Date of eligibility for grant of Stage 2 (Pre-Revised Rs. 10,000-325-15,200) (Revised Rs. 15,600-39,100+AGP Rs. 7,000)
1.	Dr. Roshan Usapkar, Assistant Professor in Commerce, Sant Sohrobanth Ambiyé Govt. College of Arts and Commerce, Pernem-Goa	10-10-2016.

The Pay shall be fixed as per the rules in force accordingly.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*Prasad G. Volvoikar*, Under Secretary (Higher Education).

Porvorim, 16th October, 2019.

#### Order

No. ACAD III/GC-04/CAS/50/2019/6239

On the recommendation of the Screening Committee, Government is pleased to grant of Senior Scale (Pre-Revised Rs. 10,000-325-15,200) (Revised Rs. 15,600-39,100+AGP Rs. 7,000), Stage 3 (Pre-revised Rs. 12,000-420-18,300) (Revised Rs. 15,600-39,100+AGP Rs. 8,000) and placement as Associate Professor as per the University Grants Commission guidelines to Dr. Shashank Maktedar, Assistant Professor in Vocal (holding additional charge of Officiating Principal), Goa College of Music, Altinho, Panaji with effect from the date indicated against his name:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Lecturer	Date of eligibility for Senior Scale (Pre-Revised Rs. 10,000-325-15,200) (Revised Rs. 15,600-39,100+ AGP Rs. 7,000)	Date of eligibility of Stage 3 (Pre-Revised Rs. 12,000-420-18,300) (Revised Rs. 15,600- 39,100+AGP Rs. 8,000)	Date of placement as Associate Professor
1.	Dr. Shashank Maktedar, Assistant Professor in Vocal (holding additional charge of Officiating Principal, Goa College of Music, Panaji-Goa)	01-07-2008	01-07-2013	01-07-2016.

The Pay shall be fixed as per the rules in force accordingly.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*Prasad G. Volvoikar*, Under Secretary (Higher Education).

Porvorim, 16th October, 2019.

## Department of Environment

—  
Order

No. 5/2/87/STE/VIII/GEPC-08/PART V/620

Read: 1) Order No. 5/2/87-STE-DIR/VIII/GEPC-08/Part/634 dated 31-08-2012, published in Official Gazette, Series II No. 24 dated 13-09-2012.

2) Corrigendum No. 5/2/87/STE-DIR/VIII/GEPC-08/Part/663 dated 06-09-2012 published in Official Gazette, Series II No. 24 dated 13-09-2012.

In supersession of Order No. 5/2/87-STE-DIR/VIII/GEPC-08/Part/634 dated 31st August, 2012, published in Official Gazette, Series II No. 24 dated 13th September, 2012, and corrigendum read above at (2), the Government of Goa is pleased to re-constitute the "Goa State Environment Protection Council (GEPC)" as follows:

Sr. No.	Name	Designation
1	2	3
1.	Governor of Goa	Chairperson.
2.	Chief Minister of Goa	Vice-Chairperson.
3.	Minister for Environment	Co-Vice-Chairperson.
4.	M. P. (Lok Sabha) North Goa	Member.
5.	Shri Shripad Naik, M.P. (Lok Sabha), North Goa	Member.
6.	Shri Francisco Sardinha, M.P. (Lok Sabha), South Goa	Member.
7.	Minister for Science & Technology	Member.
8.	Leader of Opposition	Member.
9.	Shri Dayanand Sopte (MLA), Mandrem	Member.
10.	Shri Pratapsingh Rane (MLA), Poriem	Member.
11.	Shri Nilkhant Halarnkar (MLA), Tivim	Member.
12.	Shri Joshua De Souza (MLA), Mapusa	Member.
13.	Shri Glenn Ticlo (MLA), Aldona	Member.
14.	Shri Subhash Shirodkar (MLA), Shiroda	Member.
15.	Smt. Alina Saldanha (MLA), Cortalim	Member.
16.	Shri Aleixo Lourenco (MLA), Curtorim	Member.
17.	Shri Churchill Alemao (MLA), Benaulim	Member.

1	2	3
17.	Shri Prasad Gaonkar (MLA), Sanguem	Member.
18.	Shri Vijai Sardessai (MLA), Fatorda	Member.
19.	Shri Jayesh Salgaonkar (MLA), Saligao	Member.
20.	Shri Rohan Khaunte (MLA), Porvorim	Member.
21.	Shri Ramkrishna Dhavalikar (MLA), Marcaim	Member.
22.	Shri K. D. Sadhale, Nirmal Vishwa, Ponda	Member.
23.	Shri Rajendra Kerkar, Vivekanand Environment Brigade	Member.
24.	Executive Secretary, Council for Social Justice & Peace	Member.
25.	Dr. Sushant Naik, Scientist, N.I.O., Dona Paula	Member.
26.	Dr. Nandkumar Kamat, Asst. Prof., Goa University & Member, Goa State Planning Board	Member.
27.	Dr. Savio Correia, Vasco-da-Gama	Member.
28.	Chief Secretary, Government of Goa	Member.
29.	Addl. Principal Chief Conservator of Forests	Member.
30.	Chief Engineer, Water Resources Department	Member.
31.	Director, Department of Science & Technology	Member.
32.	Director, Department of Environment	Member.
33.	Director, Directorate of Industries, Trade & Commerce	Member.
34.	Director, Directorate of Mines & Geology	Member.
35.	Director, Directorate of Panchayats	Member.
36.	Director, Directorate of Municipal Administration	Member.
37.	Director, Department of Tourism	Member.
38.	Director, Directorate of Health	Member.
39.	Director, Directorate of Agriculture	Member.

1	2	3
40.	Chief Town Planner, Town & Country Planning Department	Member.
41.	Member Secretary, Goa State Pollution Control Board	Member.
42.	Member Secretary, Goa State Biodiversity Board	Member.
43.	Managing Director, Goa Waste Management Corporation	Member.
44.	Representative of Nodal Agency for Climate Change, Saligao	Member.
45.	Representative of Nodal Agency for Wetland Authority, Saligao	Member.
46.	Project Co-ordinator, Centre for Environment Education (CEE), Goa Chapter	Special Invitee.
47.	Representative of MoEF, not below rank of Director of MoEF	Special Invitee.
48.	Principal Secretary (Environment)	Member Convenor.

The Council shall:

- i) Review the work relating to Environment undertaken in the State by Government and non-Government Organizations.
- ii) Advise the State Government on environmental issues of the State, and
- iii) Identify areas requiring investigations, research and restoration in the field of environment.

The Council will meet twice a year or more frequently, as may be decided by the Chairman, to discuss the items suggested by the Members. Decisions will be arrived at by consensus and would be advisory in nature.

Outstation members shall be entitled for, to and fro air fare, from the point of 'his/her' 'headquarters/ residence' as the case may be, plus other allowances as admissible to Grade-I Officers.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*Johnson Fernandes*, Director & ex officio Joint Secretary (Environment).

Porvorim, 16th October, 2019.

## Notification

No. 7/4/98/STE-DIR/PART-II/670

Read: Order dated 23-10-2018, 30-10-2018 & 31-10-2018 in various IAs filed in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 278 of 2015 passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court.

Whereas, the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide its Judgement & Orders read above has given directions on manufacture, distribution and use of fire crackers in the Country. In light of these directions and as per the modified directions contained in Hon'ble Supreme Court order dated 30-10-2018 the State Government hereby prescribes following timings for bursting of fire crackers during the Diwali festival in the year 2019.

1. On the day of the Diwali i.e. on 27th October, 2019 fire crackers are allowed to be burst in the morning from 4.30 a.m. to 5.30 a.m. and in the evening from 7.00 p.m. to 8.00 p.m. strictly.
2. For other days during the Diwali Festival period i.e. 28th & 29th October, 2019 which is being observed in the State of Goa, the fire crackers bursting time shall be strictly restricted between 8.00 p.m. to 10.00 p.m. only.
3. The Police Station in-charge of the respective Police Station shall be fully responsible for implementation of the Supreme Court directions.

This notification shall come into force with immediate effect.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*Johnson B. Fernandes*, Director & ex officio Jt. Secretary (Environment).

Porvorim, 23rd October, 2019.



## Department of General Administration

## Notification

No. 2/1/2017-GAD-III/3366

In pursuance of sub-section (1) of Section 135B of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 (Central Act 43 of 1951) and the 'Explanation' to Section 25 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (Act 26 of 1881) read with Notification No. U-11030/2/73-UTL dated 28-06-1973 of the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, published in the Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part II, Section 3, sub-section (ii), the Government of Goa hereby declares Monday, the 21st October, 2019

(Asvina 29, Saka 1941) as a “paid holiday”, being the polling day for General Election to Legislative Assembly of Maharashtra, 2019, to the following workers who are entitled to vote at the said Election namely:-

- (i) industrial workers;
- (ii) daily wage workers of the Government Departments and State Government Industrial Departments;
- (iii) commercial and industrial workers of private establishments;
- (iv) workers of all private establishments;
- (v) daily wage/casual workers employed in any business, trade, industrial undertakings or any other establishments.

The aforesaid paid holiday shall be in addition to the holidays indicated in the Government Notification No. 37/5/2018-GAD-III/3268 dated 14-11-2018, published in the Official Gazette, Series II No. 33 dated 15-11-2018, to the aforesaid workers.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*Gouresh S. Kurtikar*, Joint Secretary (GA).

Porvorim, 18th October, 2019.

### Department of Labour

#### Order

No. 28/23/2019-LAB/642

Whereas, the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. Colgate Palmolive (India) Limited, Kundaim Industrial Estate, Kundaim, Goa, and its workman, Shri Madhusudan S. Ghadigaonkar, Operator, in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the “said dispute”);

And whereas, the Government of Goa considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947) (hereinafter referred to as the “said Act”), the Government of Goa hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Labour Court-II of Goa at Panaji-Goa, constituted under Section 7(1) of the said Act.

#### SCHEDULE

- “(1) Whether the action of the management of M/s. Colgate Palmolive (India) Limited, Kundaim Industrial Estate, Kundaim, Goa, in dismissing from service its workman, namely, Shri Madhusudan S. Ghadigaonkar, Operator, with effect from 16-08-2018, is legal and justified?
- (2) If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?”.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*A. S. Mahatme*, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 17th October, 2019.

#### Order

No. 28/24/2019-LAB/644

Whereas, the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. Goa State Co-operative Milk Producers Union Limited, Curti, Ponda, Goa, and its workman, Shri Nitin S. Kolvekar, EMT Technician, represented by the Goa Milk Union Employees Association, in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the “said dispute”);

And whereas, the Government of Goa considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947) (hereinafter referred to as the “said Act”), the Government of Goa hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Labour Court-II of Goa at Panaji-Goa, constituted under Section 7(1) of the said Act.

#### SCHEDULE

- “(1) Whether the demand of Shri Nitin S. Kolvekar, EMT Technician, as well as that of the Goa Milk Union Employees Association, for the Pay Scale of Rs. 1200-30-1440-EB-40-2040 with effect from 01-06-1995 along with other consequential benefits, is legal and justified?
- (2) If yes, what relief the workman is entitled to?”.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*A. S. Mahatme*, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 17th October, 2019.



**Order**

No. 28/25/2019-LAB/645

Whereas, the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. National Travels, Panaji, Goa, and its workman, Shri Krishna A. Kalangutkar, Driver, in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the "said dispute");

And whereas, the Government of Goa considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947) (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act"), the Government of Goa hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Labour Court-II of Goa at Panaji-Goa, constituted under Section 7(1) of the said Act.

**SCHEDULE**

"(1) Whether the severance of Employer and Employee relationship between M/s. National Travels, Panaji, Goa, and Shri Krishna A. Kalangutkar, Driver, with effect from May, 2016, amounts to termination of services?

(2) Whether the workman is entitled to any relief?"

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

A. S. Mahatme, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 17th October, 2019.

**Notification**

No. 28/2/2019-LAB/Part-III/630

The following Award passed by the Labour Court-II, at Panaji-Goa on 24-09-2019 in Case No. Ref. IT/15/2005 is hereby published as required under Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

A. S. Mahatme, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 16th October, 2019.

**LABOUR COURT-II**  
**GOVERNMENT OF GOA AT PANAJI**

**(Before Shri Suresh N. Narulkar, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)**

Case No. Ref. IT/15/2005

Shri Andrew Noronha,  
R/o. H. No. 580, Pilimbhi Waddo,  
Siolim, Bardez-Goa. ... Workman/Party I  
V/s

M/s. G.K.B. Ophthalmic Pvt. Ltd.,  
16-A, T, Thivim Industrial Estate,  
Thivim, Mapusa-Goa. ... Employer/Party II  
Workman/Party I represented by Adv. Shri Suhas Naik.

Employer/Party II represented by Adv. Shri A. V. Nigalye.

Panaji, Dated: 24-09-2019.

**AWARD**

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947), the Government of Goa, by Order dated 20-06-2005, bearing No. 28/13/2005-LAB/276, referred the following dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal of Goa. The Government of Goa vide its another order dated 09-02-2016 transferred the present dispute to this Labour Court-II, Panaji, Goa.

*"(1) Whether the action of the management of M/s. GKB Ophthalmics Private Limited, Thivim, Mapusa, Goa, in dismissing from service the workman, Shri Andrew Nornha, permanent operator, with effect from 26-03-2003, is legal and justified?"*

*"(2) If not, what relief the Workman is entitled to?"*

2. On receipt of the reference, a case was registered under No. IT/15/2005 and registered A/D notice was issued to the Parties. In pursuance to the said notice, the Parties put in their appearance. The Workman/Party-I (for short 'Workman'), filed his statement of claim on 20-02-2008 at Exb-6. The facts of the case in brief as pleaded by the Workman are that he was employed with the Employer/Party II (for short, 'Employer') as an 'operator' at Thivim Industrial Estate, Mapusa, Bardez, Goa. He stated that he was issued a charge-sheet dated 27-03-2002 alleging certain acts of misconducts. He stated that he filed his reply to the said charge-sheet, denying each and every allegations vide its reply

dated 01-04-2002. He stated that however, the Employer conducted the enquiry against him by appointing an Enquiry Officer.

3. He submitted that the enquiry was conducted by Ld. Enquiry Officer in gross violation of principles of natural justice. He submitted that in the enquiry he was not allowed to get himself represented by the representative of his choice and without presence of any Defense Representative, Ld. Enquiry Officer has wrongly recorded that he was assisted in the enquiry by the Defense Representative. He submitted that Ld. Enquiry Officer forced him to participate in the enquiry without taking any assistance of any Defense Representative. He submitted that Ld. Enquiry Officer recorded the written objections raised by him in the said enquiry proceedings. He submitted that his objections were never taken on record by the said Enquiry Officer and as such he was forced to file his written objections after closure of the days proceedings by registered A/D and begged to rely on all such written objections which were raised by him in writing. He submitted that vide letter dated 18-06-2002, he objected for the evidence of the management witnesses one after another without giving him any opportunity to cross-examine the said witnesses. He submitted that however, Ld. Enquiry Officer went ahead with the above procedure without allowing the cross-examination of the said witnesses. He submitted that he also made a request to record the evidence de-novo. He submitted that however, the said request was also turned down by the said Enquiry Officer, which resulted in injustice and prejudice to his defense. He submitted that the Enquiry Officer went ahead with the enquiry proceedings without explaining the procedure of the enquiry to him as per his own whims and fancies, which prejudiced his defense. He submitted that Ld. Enquiry Officer had acted totally in a biased and prejudicial manner in favour of the management and flouted the mandatory provisions of conducting the enquiry in fair and proper manner. He submitted that Ld. Enquiry Officer was totally ignorant about the procedure to be followed in the enquiry and as such a request was made to change the Enquiry Officer, which was again turned down. He submitted that Ld. Enquiry Officer has also failed to inform the next stage of the enquiry and was giving the dates arbitrarily in a high ended fashion without taking into consideration his convenience. He submitted that Ld. Enquiry Officer was recording the proceedings of the enquiry in a locked room by keeping the workman outside of the said room and as such he was not aware as to

what was recorded in the said four walls of the room. He submitted that the objections were raised by him in his letters dated 26-09-2002 and dated 04-10-2002. He submitted that he was not given the documents, which was requested by him during the course of enquiry. He submitted that the proceedings were never recorded in his presence especially dated 04-10-2002 though wrongly mentioned in the proceedings that he participated in the enquiry. He submitted that a detailed objections were raised to that effect, vide letter dated 06-11-2002. He submitted that the objections raised by them on 02-12-2002 and on 17-12-2002 were also not considered by the Enquiry Officer. He submitted that Ld. Enquiry Officer as well as the Management Representative acted in excess of their jurisdiction, which is evident from the proceedings as well as from the findings given by the Enquiry Officer. He submitted that Ld. Enquiry Officer as well as Management Representative were specifically appointed to investigate into the charge-sheet dated 27-03-2002 relating to the incident dated 24-11-2001 during the day shift at 11.00 hours. He submitted that however, Ld. Enquiry Officer as well as the Management Representative arbitrarily and illegally changed the date and time of the charge-sheets without having any locus standi or authority to do so. He submitted that the aforesaid action on the part of Ld. Enquiry Officer as well as Management Representative is totally illegal, unjustified and bad-in-law. He submitted that the Management Representative was a qualified advocate. He submitted that Ld. Enquiry Officer was also a qualified labour law practitioner and as such both are well aware of the procedures of the enquiry and the legalities and technicalities involved in the enquiry. He submitted that the workman was ignorant of the procedure of the enquiry as well as examination of witnesses i.e. examination-in-chief as well as cross-examination. He submitted that the Enquiry Officer has recorded the statement of witnesses to suit the case of the management and sometimes recorded the statements, which were not even stated in the enquiry. He submitted that Ld. Enquiry Officer was obtaining his signature hurriedly on the proceedings sheets without allowing him to go through the said proceedings sheets. He submitted that Ld. Enquiry Officer never explained him to read over the contents of the proceedings recorded by him and as such without knowing the contents his signatures were obtained on the statements as well as the proceedings sheets which were prepared by him. He submitted that not a single charges levelled against him have been proved in the departmental enquiry for the above reasons. He



submitted that he disputes the entire dismissal order dated 26-03-2002 as illegal, unjustified and bad-in-law and as such liable to be quashed and set aside. Without prejudice to his aforesaid contentions, he submitted that the punishment of dismissal is shockingly disproportionate and hence, liable to be set aside. He submitted that the punishment of dismissal is an act of victimization and unfair labour practice.

4. He submitted that being aggrieved with the dismissal order dated 26-03-2003, he raised an industrial dispute before the office of Labour Commissioner vide letter dated 09-05-2003, which ended in failure. He submitted that he is presently unemployed and does not have any source of income. The Workman therefore prayed that the action of the Employer in dismissing him from service w.e.f. 26-03-2003 be held as illegal, unjustified and bad-in-law and direct the Employer to reinstate him back in service with full back wages, continuity in service and all other consequential benefits thereof.

5. The Employer resisted the claim of the workman by filing its written statement dated 11-04-2008 at Exb. 8. The Employer stated that it is a company incorporated under the Companies Act, 1956 and is engaged in the manufacture of ophthalmic lenses at the said factory.

The Employer admitted that the Workman was employed in the said factory as an 'operator'. The Employer stated that during his short tenure of employment with them, the Workman indulge in serious acts of misconduct leading to the termination of his services. The Employer stated that on 24-11-2001, the workman was working in the Toric department of the factory during the day shift. The Employer stated that at around 12.00 hours, when his co-employee namely, Shri Sadanand Munankar approached him for taking empty trays from his workplace, he abused and assaulted him. The Employer stated that the said acts on the part of the Workman amounts to misconduct under its Certified Standing Orders. The Employer stated that a charge-sheet dated 27-03-2002 was issued to the workman in respect of his aforesaid misconduct. The Employer stated that however, due to clerical mistake, the time of the incident was mentioned as 16.00 hours instead of 12.00 hours. The Employer stated that this mistake was subsequently corrected at the initial stage of the enquiry. The Employer stated that his explanation to the said charge-sheet was not found to be satisfactory. The Employer stated that thereafter an enquiry was held into the said charges

by Shri Prashant D. Mallya, its Company Secretary, who was appointed as the Enquiry Officer.

6. The Employer submitted that the workman was given full opportunity to participate in the enquiry and to defend himself. The Employer submitted that it has conducted an enquiry in a fair and proper manner in accordance with the principles of natural justice. The Employer submitted that the findings of the Enquiry Officer are based on material on record and they are fair and proper. The Employer stated that on conclusion of the enquiry, Ld. Enquiry Officer submitted his findings, holding that the charges alleged against the workman stands proved. The Employer stated that the management accepted the said findings. The Employer submitted that the charges alleged and proved against the workman were very grave and serious which also related to the discipline in the establishment. The Employer submitted that since the acts committed by the workman amounts to major misconduct of abusing and assaulting a co-worker, it has awarded the punishment of dismissal to the workman after complying with the requirements of the law. The Employer submitted that the punishment awarded to the workman is commensurate to the offense committed by him. The Employer stated that there were no mitigating circumstances to award any lesser penalty. The Employer submitted that its action in dismissing the workman is therefore fair and proper and this Hon'ble Tribunal may hold the same accordingly. The Employer submitted that the action of the Government of referring the purported dispute is without jurisdiction and/or in excess of the jurisdiction. Without prejudice to its aforesaid contention, the Employer submitted that in the event this Hon'ble Tribunal holds that the said enquiry is not fair and proper or is vitiated for any reason whatsoever or the findings of the Enquiry Officer are not based on records, this Hon'ble Tribunal be pleased to give an opportunity to them to lead fresh/additional evidence to prove charges of misconduct against the workman and justify the order of dismissal. The Employer denied the overall case as pleaded by the workman and prayed that the workman is not entitled for any relief.

7. Thereafter, the Workman filed his rejoinder on 13-06-2008 at Exb. 10. The Workman, by way of his Re-joinder, confirms and reiterates all the submissions and averments made by him in his claim statement to be true and correct and denies all the statements and averments made by the Employer in the Written Statement, which are contrary to the statements and averments made by him.

8. Based on the pleadings filed by the respective parties, this court framed the following issues on 26-08-2008 at Exb. 14.

1. Whether the Party-I proves that the enquiry held against him is not fair and proper?
2. Whether the charges levelled against the Party I are proved to the satisfaction of the Tribunal?
3. Whether the Party-I proves that the action of the Party II in dismissing his services is illegal and unjustified?
4. What relief? What Order?

9. Among the said issues, the issue No. 1 and 2 have been treated as preliminary issues. Both the parties i.e. the Workman as well as the Employer led their evidence respectively and the matter was fixed for order on the findings of the preliminary issue No. 1 and 2, after hearing the arguments of both the parties. It is at this stage, Ld. Adv. Shri Suhas Naik, appearing for the Workman as well as Ld. Adv. Shri A.V. Nigalye, appearing for the Employer orally submitted that they are trying to settle the matter amicably, accordingly, Ld. Adv. Shri Suhas Naik, appearing for the Workman as well as Ld. Adv. Shri A.V. Nigalye, appearing for the Employer alongwith the Workman as well as the Manager of the Employer remained present on 12-09-2019 and submitted that the parties have amicably settled the matter and filed terms of consent at Exb. 20 and prayed for passing consent award. The terms of settlement appearing in Exb. 20 are reproduced hereunder:

- a. The Employer/Party II is hereby paying an amount of Rs. 75,000/- (Rupees seventy five thousand only) to the Workman/Party I in full and final settlement of the claim by Party I. The said amount is paid by a demand draft dated 28-08-2019 drawn on State Bank of India, Panaji Branch bearing No. 111399. The Party II is also paying an amount of Rs. 10,662/- (Rupees ten thousand six hundred and sixty two only) to the workman/Party I vide cheque No. 877754 dated 11-09-2019 drawn on State Bank of India, Mapusa Branch towards the gratuity payable to Workman/Party I. The Workman/Party I acknowledges the receipt of the same.
- b. The Workman/Party I hereby agrees and declares that all his claims and demands against Party II/Employer are hereby conclusively settled on payment of the aforesaid amounts and he has no further claim or demand of whatsoever nature against the

Employer/Party II. Similarly, the Party II/Employer shall have no claim or demand against the Workman/Party I.

- c. The parties shall file these consent terms in the Hon'ble Labour Court-II, Government of Goa at Panaji in the reference No. IT/15/2005 with a request to pass consent award as per these consent terms.

I have carefully perused the said terms of settlement at Exb. 20 signed by and between the parties hereinabove. The said terms of settlement are beneficial to both the parties. Hence, I consented for the same. Since the dispute under reference is settled between the parties, I hold that the dispute under present reference does not survive.

In view of the above, I proceed to pass the following order:

#### ORDER

1. It is held that the action of the management of M/s. GKB Ophthalmics Private Limited, Thivim, Mapusa, Goa, in dismissing from service the workman, Shri Andrew Nornha, permanent operator, with effect from 26-03-2003, is legal and justified?, does not survive.
2. The Workman, Shri Andrew Nornha, is not entitled to any relief.
3. No order as to costs.

Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-  
(Suresh N. Narulkar),  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court-II.

#### Notification

No. 28/2/2019-LAB/Part-VI/632

The following Award passed by the Labour Court-II, at Panaji-Goa on 16-09-2019 in Case No. Ref. LC-II/IT/13/2018 is hereby published as required under Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

A. S. Mahatme, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 16th October, 2019.

THE LABOUR COURT-II  
GOVERNMENT OF GOA AT PANAJI  
(Before Shri Suresh N. Narulkar, Hon'ble  
Presiding Officer)

Case No. LC-II/IT/13/2018

Shri Sujeet T. Naik,  
R/o. Manaswada,  
Kundaim, Goa.  
V/s

... Workman/Party-I

M/s. Goa Invescast Limited,  
105-106, Kundaim Industrial Estate,  
Kundaim, Goa. ... Employer/Party-II

Workman/Party-I represented by Shri Subhash Naik  
George.

Employer/Party-II marked as ex-parte.

Panaji, Dated: 16-09-2019

AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947) the Government of Goa, by Order dated 05-07-2018, bearing No. 28/15/2018-LAB/439 referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Labour Court-II, Panaji, Goa.

*"(1) Whether Shri Sujeet T. Naik, Supervisor can be construed as "workman" as defined under Section 2 (s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947)?*

*(2) If the answer to the issue No. (1) above is in the affirmative, then, whether the action of the management of M/s. Goa Invescast Limited, 105-106, Kundaim Industrial Estate, Kundaim, Goa in terminating the services of Shri Sujeet T. Naik, Supervisor, with effect from 26-12-2017, is legal and justified?*

*(3) If the answer to the issue No. (2) above is in the negative, then, what relief the workman is entitled to?"*

2. On receipt of the reference, a case was registered under No. LC-II/ IT/13/18 and registered A/D notice was issued to the Parties. In pursuance to the said notice, the Parties put in their appearance. The Workman/Party-I (for short 'Workman'), filed his Statement of Claim on 03-09-2018 at Exb-5. The facts of the case in brief as pleaded by the Workman are that the Employer/ /Party II (for short, "Employer") is a factory engaged in the production of steel castings. He stated that the castings are used for various machinery parts,

automobile parts etc. He stated that he was employed with the Employer initially as a 'Trainee Maintenance' w.e.f. 22-08-2005. He stated that he was confirmed in service as a permanent workman w.e.f. 01-04-2006. He stated that he was designated as 'supervisor E1' grade on a monthly salary of Rs. 3100/- p.m. He stated that his salary was revised to Rs. 5600/- p.m. w.e.f. 01-07-2010 and thereafter to Rs. 7000/- p.m. w.e.f. 11-11-2010 and again to Rs. 8400/- p.m. w.e.f. 01-12-2012 and lastly to Rs. 9400/- p.m. w.e.f. 30-12-2013. He stated that he used to perform duties such as electrical or mechanical maintenance and repair work including cleaning of machines, fabrication work, welding, loading of diesel etc. He stated that he was reporting to Mr. Sudhakar Naik and Mr. Laxmikant Naik, Maintenance In-charge. He stated that he would do the work assigned to him by them from time to time. He stated that the Employer maintained daily work report of work done by him. He stated that he used to work in all three shifts. He stated that in second and third shift, he had to work alone with no one else and without safety.

3. He stated that on 26-12-2017, he came for duties in first shift at around 3.30 p.m. Mr. John Kuryan, the Managing Director informed the workman to see him before leaving the factory premises for home. He stated that accordingly, he met him in his cabin. He stated that the Managing Director gave him a letter saying that there was a letter for him. He stated that the said letter dated 26-12-2017 pertains to his termination of service w.e.f. 26-12-2017. He stated that aggrieved by the decision of the Employer for illegally terminating his services, he wrote a letter to the Employer vide its letter dated 04-01-2018 demanding reinstatement in service with full back wages and continuity of service with costs. He stated that the Employer did not reply to his said letter. He stated that he therefore raised an industrial dispute before the Asstt. Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer vide his letter dated 19-02-2018 demanding reinstatement in service with full back wages with cost, which ended in failure.

4. The Workman contended that no one month notice was given to him before termination of his services. He submitted that no retrenchment compensation was paid to him at the time of termination of his services. He submitted that no seniority list was prepared before termination of services and principles of last cum first go was not followed at the time of termination. He submitted that junior Workmen compared to him were retained in service. He submitted that the Employer did not comply with the mandatory provisions of

Section 25-F and 25-G of the I.D. Act, 1947 and hence, the termination is ab-initio void, illegal and unjustified. He submitted that he therefore entitled for reinstatement in service with full back wages and continuity in service. He submitted that he is a 'workman' as defined under the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. He submitted that he had worked with the Employer from 22-08-2005 till 26-12-2017 and had worked for more than 240 days in one year prior to his termination. The Workman therefore prayed that he be reinstated in service with full back wages and continuity in service with cost.

5. The Employer resisted the claim of the workman by filing its written statement on 08-01-2019 at Exb. 7. The Employer, as and by way of its preliminary objections, submitted that the dispute raised by the workman in the present reference is not an 'industrial dispute' as defined u/s 2 (k) of the I.D. Act, that the Party I was employed as supervisor E1 with the Employer and as such he was not a 'workman' as defined u/s 2 (s) of the I.D. Act, 1947 and that there is no application of mind by the Appropriate Government while referring the present dispute.

6. The Employer stated that it is a company registered under Indian Companies Act, 1956. The Employer admitted that it is engaged in the production of steel casting as per the demands of customers. The Employer admitted that the castings are used for various machinery parts, automobile parts etc. The Employer stated that the workman joined in its service w.e.f. 23-08-2005 and he was confirmed in service w.e.f. 26-12-2006. The Employer stated that the Workman was working specifically in the managerial and supervisory cadre with them and hence, he is not a 'workman' within the meaning of Section 2 (s) of the I.D. Act. The Employer stated that the workman being a supervisor, the predominant duties performed by him was of supervisory and managerial in nature. The Employer stated that the Workman was holding the post of trust of the management and hence, his claim need not be entertained by this Hon'ble Court. The Employer stated that the workman was issued a letter of termination/relieving letter dated 26-12-2017 on the ground of consequent slump in production and invoicing. The Employer stated that they have informed the Workman that it had become extremely difficult to maintain the current staff strength for the Company. The Employer stated that it was also mentioned in the said letter of termination that its cash flow situation is going out of control and they were finding it difficult to keep the operation running. The Employer stated that it was also mentioned in the

said letter that the present economic scenario in the country has added additional burden to them, which is already struggling under heavy debts. The Employer stated that its management had taken a decision with lot of pain to reduce manpower and maintain at a lower level required just to run this reduced operations. The Employer stated that the Workman was relieved from its services after working hours on 26-12-2017 enclosing his relieving letter with a cheque No. 2855 dated 26-12-2017 amounting to Rs. 60,990/- towards his final settlement which was realized in the account of the workman on 22-03-2018. The Employer denied the overall case as pleaded by the Workman and prayed for rejection of the present reference.

7. Thereafter, the Workman filed his rejoinder on 08-01-2019 at Exb. 06. The Workman, by way of his Re-joinder, confirms and reiterates all the submissions and averments made by him in his claim statement to be true and correct and denies all the statements and averments made by the Employer in the Written Statement, which are contrary to the statements and averments made by him.

8. Based on the pleadings filed by the respective parties, this court framed the following issues on 23-01-2019 at Exb. 8.

1. Whether the Workman/Party I proves that he is a 'workman' within the meaning of Section 2 (s) of the I.D. Act, 1947?
2. Whether the Workman/Party I proves that the action of the Employer in terminating his services with effect from 26-12-2017 is illegal and unjustified?
3. Whether the Employer/Party II proves that the reference is not maintainable in view of the reasons mentioned in para (a), (b) and (c) as and by way of its preliminary objections?
4. Whether the Workmen are entitled for any relief?
5. What Order? What Award?

9. My findings to the aforesaid issues are as under:

- |                     |   |                     |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|
| (a) Issue No. 1     | : | In the Affirmative  |
| (b) Issue No. 2     | : | In the Affirmative. |
| (c) Issue No. 3     | : | In the Negative.    |
| (d) Issue No. 4 & 5 | : | As per final order. |

I have heard the ex-parte oral arguments of Ld. Rep. Shri Subhash Naik George, appearing for the Workman. I have carefully perused the entire records of the present case. I have also carefully considered the arguments advanced by Ld. Rep. Shri Subhash Naik George.



10. *Issue No. 1:*

The burden was cast on the Party I to prove the issue No. 1. To prove his case, the Party I examined himself and produced on record certain documentary evidence in support of his oral evidence. The said oral as well as documentary evidence produced on record by the Party I remained unchallenged for want of cross-examination.

11. The Party I, in his oral evidence on record, deposed that he was initially employed as trainee maintenance w.e.f. 22-08-2005 and confirmed in service as a permanent workman w.e.f. 01-04-2006 and designated as "supervisor E1" grade. The oral evidence of the Party I on record indicates that he was performing the duties such as electrical or mechanical maintenance or repair work including cleaning of machines, fabrication work, welding, loading of diesel etc. He was reporting to Mr. Sudhakar Naik and Mr. Laxmikant Naik, Maintenance In-charge. The aforesaid duties performed by the Party I as supervisor E1 grade are of skilled and technical in nature and as such the Party I is a 'workman' within the meaning of Section 2 (s) of the I.D. Act, 1947. The issue No. 1 is therefore answered in the affirmative.

12. *Issue No. 2:*

The evidence on record indicates that the workman was in the employment of the Employer w.e.f. 22-08-2005 till 26-12-2017. The evidence on record indicates that he had worked more than 240 days preceding the twelve months prior to the date of termination of his service. The evidence on record indicates that the services of the workman have been terminated without following the mandatory provisions of Section 25-F and Section 25-G of the I.D. Act, 1947 and no fault of him. The evidence on record indicates that no seniority list was prepared before termination of services of the workman. The evidence on record indicates that the principles of last come first go was not followed at the time of termination of services of the workman. Hence, it is held that the termination of service of the workman w.e.f. 26-12-2017 is illegal and unjustified. The issue No. 2 is answered in the affirmative.

13. *Issue No. 3:*

The Employer, as and by way of its preliminary objections, filed in its written statement, submitted that the Party I is not a 'workman' within the meaning of Section 2 (s) of the I.D. Act and as such the dispute raised by the workman is not an 'industrial dispute' as defined u/s 2 (k) of the I.D. Act, 1947 and that there is no application of mind

by the Appropriate Government while referring the present dispute. The burden was cast on the Employer to prove the said allegations. The Employer has however, failed to lead any evidence either oral or documentary in support of its submissions.

Even otherwise, while deciding the issue No. 1 hereinabove, I have discussed and come to the conclusion that the Party I is a 'workman' within the meaning of Section 2 (s) of the I.D. Act, 1947. Hence, the dispute raised by the workman pertaining to his non-employment is an industrial dispute within the meaning of Section 2 (k) of the I.D. Act, 1947. Consequently, the present reference made by the Appropriate Government is just and fair. In view of above, it is held that the Employer failed to prove that the reference is not maintainable in view of the reasons mentioned in para (a), (b) and (c) of its written statement as and by way of its preliminary objections. The issue No. 3 is therefore answered in the negative.

14. *Issue No. 4:*

While deciding the issue No. 2 hereinabove, I have discussed and come to the conclusion that the action of the Employer in terminating the services of the workman w.e.f. 26-12-2017 is illegal and unjustified.

The Workman was employed with the Employer continuously for the period from 22-08-2005 till his services were terminated w.e.f. 26-12-2017. Neither the Workman pleaded nor stated on oath that he is gainfully unemployed from the date of termination of his services w.e.f. 26-12-2017. The Employer also did not plead that the workman is gainfully employed in any of the establishment. The services of the workman has been terminated without any fault on his behalf. Taking into consideration the payment of Rs. 60,990/- (Rupees sixty thousand nine hundred ninety only) made by the Employer, the workman is entitled for reinstatement in service without any back wages and consequential benefits thereof.

In view of the above, I proceed to pass the following order:

## ORDER

1. It is held that Shri Sujeet T. Naik, Supervisor is a "workman" as defined under Section 2 (s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.
2. It is held that the action of the management of M/s. Goa Invescast Limited, 105-106, Kundaim Industrial Estate, Kundaim, Goa in terminating the services of Shri Sujeet T. Naik, Supervisor, with effect from 26-12-2017, is illegal and unjustified.



3. It is further held that M/s. Goa Invescast Limited, 105-106, Kundaim Industrial Estate, Kundaim, Goa is hereby directed to reinstate the workman, Shri Sujeet T. Naik without any back wages, continuity in service and consequential benefits thereof.

4. No order as to costs.

Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-  
(Suresh N. Narulkar),  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court-II.

◆◆◆  
Department of Law & Judiciary  
Law (Establishment) Division

—  
**Notification**

No. 8/78/2019-LD(Estt)/1909

In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 78A of the Registration Act, 1908 (16 of 1908), as in force in the State of Goa (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act"), the Government of Goa hereby approves the refund of the excess registration fees of Rs. 50,510/- (Rupees fifty thousand five hundred and ten only) to Shri Kush Kumar, paid by him towards registration of the Deed of Sale.

This issues with the concurrence of Finance Department (Revenue & Control), vide U.O. No. 1400068309 dated 01-10-2019.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Amir Y. Parab, Under Secretary (Estt.).  
Porvorim, 14th October, 2019.

◆◆◆  
Department of Personnel

—  
**Order**

No. 6/9/2009-PER/Part-IV/2834

On the recommendation of Goa Services Board, the Governor of Goa is pleased to transfer and post Smt. Sandhya S. Kamat, Director of Civil Supplies as Director of Tribal Welfare and Shri Sagun Velip, Director of Tribal Welfare as Director of Civil Supplies, with immediate effect, in public interest.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Shashank V. Thakur, Under Secretary (Personnel-I).  
Porvorim, 18th October, 2019.

**Addendum**

No. 4/12/85-PER-Vol.I/2751

Read: Order No. 4/12/85-PER-Vol.-I/3160 dated 30-11-2018.

In the order read in the preamble, the following shall be added:

"Shri Madhav B. Kelkar, Director of Agriculture, holding the charge on officiating basis shall be entitled for charge allowance in terms of the O.M. No. 2/38/75-PER(Vol III) dated 25-08-2004".

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Maya Pednekar, Under Secretary (Personnel-II).  
Porvorim, 15th October, 2019.

◆◆◆  
**Department of Planning**

Directorate of Planning, Statistics & Evaluation

—  
**Order**

No. DPSE/I/ADMN/DEPU/4/2018/VOL-II/1685

Sub.: Appointment against the post of Project Economist on deputation basis.

Shri Arjun Paik Gaonkar, Research Assistant of the Common Statistical Cadre is hereby transferred and posted as Project Economist on deputation basis initially for a period of one year in the District Rural Development Agency, North Goa, Panaji, in the Pay Band of Rs. 9,300-34,300+4,200/- (GP) in the 7th Pay Commission at Level 6.

Shri Arjun Paik Gaonkar, Research Assistant stands relieved from this Directorate w.e.f. 09-09-2019 (b.n.) so as to enable him to join his duties at the place of his posting.

His period of deputation shall be as per the standard terms and conditions of deputation contained in O.M. No. 13/4/74/PER dated 20-11-2013 issued by the Personnel Department and as amended from time to time.

Shri Arjun Paik Gaonkar has to submit joining report to this Directorate for record.

This issues with the Government approval vide U.O. No. 1718 dated 22-08-2019.

This supersedes the earlier order No. DPSE/I/ADMN/DEPU/4/2018/1387 dated 28-08-2019.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Dr. S. Shanbhogue, Director & ex officio Joint Secretary (Planning).

Porvorim, 17th October, 2019.

## Department of Public Health

—  
Order

No. 2/1/2014-II/PHD/1666

Ex post facto approval of the Government is conveyed for accepting the resignation tendered by Dr. Deepa C., Lecturer, Department of Anaesthesiology, Goa Medical College, Bambolim-Goa vide letter dated 28-01-2019 and she stands relieved from the said post Lecturer, Department of Anaesthesiology, Goa Medical College w.e.f. 16-03-2019 (a.n.).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*Trupti B. Manerkar*, Under Secretary (Health).

Porvorim, 17th July, 2019.

## Order

No. 38/66/2018-I/PHD/2354

Read: 1) Order No. 38/66/2018-I/PHD/2060 dated 03-08-2018.

2) Order No. 38/66/2018-I/PHD/2059 dated 03-08-2018.

In supersession of the order referred above, Government is pleased to constitute the Committee State Level (1) State TB-comorbidity Co-ordination Committee (STCC) and (2) State Technical Working Group on TB-comorbidities (STWG); and (3) District level i.e. District TB-comorbidity Co-ordination Committees (DTCC), to review the co-ordination and performance of the TB-HIV joint activities comprising of the following:-

## (I) State TB-comorbidity Co-ordination Committee (STCC)

- |  |                     |
|--|---------------------|
| 1. Secretary, Health                     | — Chairman.         |
| 2. Director of Health Services           | — Vice-Chairman.    |
| 3. Chief Medical Officer/STO, RNTCP      | — Member Secretary. |
| 4. Dean, Goa Medical College             | — Member.           |
| 5. Dy. Director, Public Health           | — Member.           |
| 6. Project Director, GSACS               | — Member.           |
| 7. Chairman, State Task Force, RNTCP     | — Member.           |
| 8. Chief Medical Officer, Family Welfare | — Member.           |
| 9. Chief Medical Officer, STD            | — Member.           |
| 10. Chief Medical Officer, NCDC          | — Member.           |
| 11. State Programme Officer, NUHM        | — Member.           |

- |  |           |
|--|-----------|
| 12. Health Officer, RNTCP                              | — Member. |
| 13. State Epidemiologist                               | — Member. |
| 14. Representative from BSD, CSD, TI Division of GSACS | — Member. |
| 15. WHO Consultant, RNTCP                              | — Member. |
| 16. State TB-HIV co-ordinator                          | — Member. |
| 17. Health Officer/DTO, RNTCP                          | — Member. |
| 18. Representative of NGO working with RNTCP           | — Member. |
| 19. Representative of NGO working with other programs  | — Member. |

## (II) State Technical Working Group on TB-comorbidities (STWG)

- |   |                     |
|---|---------------------|
| 1. Mission Director (NHM)                             | — Chairman.         |
| 2. State TB Officer                                   | — Member Secretary. |
| 3. Director of Health Services                        | — Member.           |
| 4. Dy. Director (PH)                                  | — Member.           |
| 5. Project Director, GSACS                            | — Member.           |
| 6. Chief Medical Officer, Health & Family Welfare     | — Member.           |
| 7. Chief Medical Officer, STD                         | — Member.           |
| 8. H.O.D. Microbiology, Goa Medical College           | — Member.           |
| 9. H.O.D. Pulmonary Medicine, Goa Medical College     | — Member.           |
| 10. Chief Medical Officer, NCDC                       | — Member.           |
| 11. State Programme Officer, NUHM                     | — Member.           |
| 12. Health Officer, RNTCP                             | — Member.           |
| 13. State Epidemiologist                              | — Member.           |
| 14. Representative from TI division, GSACS            | — Member.           |
| 15. WHO Consultant, RNTCP                             | — Member.           |
| 16. State TB HIV co-ordination                        | — Member.           |
| 17. State IMA President or his representative         | — Member.           |
| 18. Representative of NGO working with RNTCP          | — Member.           |
| 19. Representative of NGO working with other programs | — Member.           |

## (III) District TB-Co-ordination Committees (DTCC) North Goa

- |                                 |                     |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Collector, North Goa         | — Chairman.         |
| 2. Chief Medical Officer, RNTCP | — Vice-Chairman.    |
| 3. Health Officer, RNTCP        | — Member Secretary. |

4. Medical Superintendent/ /Representative, GMC	— Member.	4. Medical Superintendent/ /Representative, GMC	— Member.
5. Medical Superintendent, Asilo Hospital	— Member.	5. Medical Superintendent/ /Hospicio Hospital	— Member.
6. Health Officer, UHC, Panaji	— Member.	6. Medical Superintendent, SDH, Ponda	— Member.
7. Health Officer, UHC, Mapusa	— Member.	7. Health Officer, RNTCP	— Member.
8. Health Officer, PHC, Sankhalim	— Member.	8. Health Officer, Margao	— Member.
9. Health Officer, PHC, Pernem	— Member.	9. Health Officer, UHC, Vasco	— Member.
10. Health Officer, PHC, Aldona	— Member.	10. Health Officer, CHC, Curchorem	— Member.
11. City TB Officer, JEET Project	— Member.	11. Health Officer, PHC, Cansaulim	— Member.
12. NGO representatives/Chairman of TB Association	— Member.	12. Medical Superintendent, SDH, Chicalim	— Member.
<b>(IV) District TB-Comorbidity Co-ordination Committees (DTCC) South Goa</b>		13. City TB Officer, JEET Project	— Member.
1. Collector, South Goa	— Chairman.	14. NGO representative/Chairman of TB Association	— Member.
2. Chief Medical Officer, RNTCP	— Vice- -Chairman.	By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.	
3. District TB Officer, South Goa	— Member Secretary.	Swati A. Dalvi, Under Secretary (Health). Porvorim, 18th October, 2019.	



### Human Resource Development Foundation Society

(A Registered Society of Government of Goa)

Under

Directorate of Skill Development & Entrepreneurship

#### Order

No. 3/4/2019/HRDF/PART(II)/361

Read: Government Order:-

- (1) No. 21/95-LAB dated 6-2-1995.
- (2) No. 21/3/95-LAB dated 19-2-1996.
- (3) No. 3/9/97-IND(9) dated 10-07-1997
- (4) No. 3/9/97-IND(9) dated 28-10-1997.
- (5) No. 3/9/97-IND(1) dated 25-02-2004.
- (6) No. 3/9/97-IND(1)/190 dated 12-12-2007.
- (7) No. 3/4/1999-HRDF/6329 dated 13-12-2007.
- (8) No. 3/4/99-HRDF/203 dated 04-01-2008.
- (9) No. 3/4/99-HRDF/214 dated 16-01-2008.
- (10) No. 3/4/2010/HRDF/(part)/889 dated 27-04-2011.
- (11) No. 3/4/2011/HRDF/PART(I)/369 dated 22-11-2013.
- (12) No. 3/4/2014/HRDF/PART(II)/26 dated 18-03-2016.

The Government is pleased to reconstitute the Governing Committee of Human Resource Development Foundation Society under the Chairmanship of the Director of Skill Development & Entrepreneurship and consisting of the following members:

- |  |   |           |
|--|---|-----------|
| 1. Director of Skill Development & Entrepreneurship,<br>Directorate of Skill Development & Entrepreneurship,<br>3rd Floor, Shramashakti Bhavan, Panaji-Goa | — | Chairman. |
| 2. Director of Education, or his representative<br>Directorate of Education, Panaji-Goa  | — | Member.   |

- |   |   |                      |
|---|---|----------------------|
| 3. Directorate of Technical Education or his representative,<br>Directorate of Technical Education, Government of Goa   | — | Member.              |
| 4. Addl. Secretary (Finance)/Jt. Secretary (Finance),<br>Finance Department, Government of Goa  | — | Member.              |
| 5. Assistant Apprenticeship Advisor,<br>Directorate of Skill Development & Entrepreneurship,<br>3rd Floor, Shramashakti Bhavan, Panaji-Goa  | — | Member.              |
| 6. Assistant Director (Training), Government of Goa,<br>Directorate of Skill Development & Entrepreneurship,<br>3rd Floor, Shramashakti Bhavan, Panaji-Goa  | — | Member<br>Secretary. |
| 7. Asst. Accounts Officer,<br>Directorate of Skill Development & Entrepreneurship,<br>3rd Floor, Shramashakti Bhavan, Panaji-Goa  | — | Treasurer.           |
| 8. Deputy Director (Admn.),<br>Directorate of Skill Development & Entrepreneurship,<br>3rd Floor, Shramashakti Bhavan, Panaji-Goa   | — | Advisor.             |
| 9. Non-Official Members:  |   |                      |
| (a) Shri Sudesh Rane, Goa State Industries Association,<br>4th Floor, Goa-IDC House, Patto Plaza, Panaji, Goa   |   |                      |
| (b) Dr. Krishna Gopal Rajanala, General Manager Human Resources,<br>Dempo Shipbuilding & Engg. Co. Ltd. Confederation of<br>Indian Industry, 1st Floor, Salgaocar Center, next to Mary<br>Immaculate Girls School, Rua de Qurem, Panaji |   |                      |
| (c) Shri B. T. Boke, Chairman of IRHR Committee, Goa Chamber<br>of Commerce & Industry, Narayan Rajaram Bandekar Bhavan,<br>T. B. Cunha Road, P. O. Box 59, Panjim, Goa   |   |                      |
| (d) Shri Nilesh Shah, Travel & Tourism Association of Goa,<br>609, Dempo Tower, 6th Floor, Patto Plaza, Panaji, Goa   |   |                      |
| (e) Shri William Vaz, Principal, Comtech Computer Academy,<br>T-1, 3rd Floor, Royal Chambers, above HDFC Bank, Tisk,<br>Ponda, Goa  |   |                      |
| (f) Shri Sadanand Hinde, Principal, Shri Bhumika Technical<br>Institute, Parye, Sanquelim-Goa   |   |                      |

All other functions/instructions/provisions incorporated and proposed/suggested in the Government Orders referred above remains unchanged.

The tenure of the non-official members of the Governing Committee shall hold office for a period of 2 years from the date of their appointment unless reappointed by the Goa Government.

This issues with the approval of the Government.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*Dipak Desai*, Director & ex officio Jt. Secretary (Skill Development & Entrepreneurship).

Panaji, 14th October, 2019.

V. No. AP-1396/2019.

[www.goaprintingpress.gov.in](http://www.goaprintingpress.gov.in)

Published and Printed by the Director, Printing & Stationery,  
Government Printing Press,  
Mahatma Gandhi Road, Panaji-Goa 403 001.

**PRICE—Rs. 17.00**

PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING PRESS, PANAJI-GOA—252/160-10/2019.